



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. IX

NEW YORK, MARCH 18, 1916

No. 20

In the University Journal of the University of Nebraska, for December, 1914 (pages 25-26), Dr. H. B. Alexander, some of whose utterances on the Classics were given in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7:33-35, had A Letter to Students.

Since what Dr. Alexander said is even more true now, part of his letter is here reproduced:

And what does this war mean for the intellect of the world? France, England and Germany have carried this earth's intellectual burdens and achieved its intellectual triumphs for the past five centuries. The training of a mind is not accomplished in a day; its gifts to society are the slow labor of years. Can anyone doubt that, whatever the outcome of the present war in a political way, its effects upon the trained minds of Western Europe can only be disastrous? The higher works of peace, when peace is restored, will suffer more terribly than all else. Science, scholarship, literature, art, these must give way to the more pressing needs of political and economic and social reconstruction; the machine must be rebuilt before its product can be manufactured, the garden must be regrown before its fruits can be forthcoming. Partly this will be due to economic stress, for mental achievement is only possible in well-provisioned societies; partly it will be due to actual loss of trained minds, the young men of university training whose lives are lost or maimed, the gifted children to whom education must be denied, the many hundreds of men whose nervous and mental strength will be permanently weakened by the stress of war; and in part it will be due to the fact that Europe will require all its surviving intellectual powers to repair its immediate ills. France, exhausted by the Napoleonic wars, required the long lethargy of the reign of Louis Philippe to regain partially its lost spiritual energy. Can any man think that the present war will not be far more deadly to the spirit of modern Europe?

And in view of this, what is our part? America is ill-prepared to become the bearer of the light of culture; it is to no trained runner that the torch is cast. Yet it is obvious that the race is to us. For the next generation, perhaps for the next century, or five centuries, we must stand in the forefront of progress, performing a great, if not the greater, share of the world's mental labors—if the work is to be performed at all. It would be the idlest of conceits for us to suppose that we can succeed in such task without the most intense and serious effort; we are as yet far from the van of progress, and must achieve what the other nations are losing before we can pass them; the immediate future of the world, despite our best, is certain to be a period of retrogression; nevertheless, if we persist, we may hope eventually to save the loss, and better it with gain. In any case the duty of effort is clear.

But what is the first step?

It is one the students must take—a step for our youth. I have already said that the training of minds is slow. It is the slowest of all work in those fields which require long and impersonal effort; for work in science and scholarship and the patient analysis of history. Without work of this character, civilization must perish; hitherto, we have borrowed its fruits from generous fatherlands; now we must mature them by our own toils.

I wish . . . to indicate one great gap in our national preparation for the task that is ours—as I think, the greatest gap. More than any other great folk we are in need of men and women with a clear sense of the sources and promptings of our civilization, with a developed historical sense, in its richest meaning. What differentiates civilized men from the savage is the civilized man's knowledge of his own history; such knowledge is the only sure anchor of culture. We cannot know ourselves until we know the past not only of those who were our physical fathers, but above all of those peoples who have given us our spiritual heritage. This is no light or easy study. It calls for knowledge of languages, ancient and modern; it calls for devotion to political, economic and social history, and to the logical analysis of fact; it calls for familiarity with the literatures, arts and philosophies of western peoples, from Greek and Hebrew to the English and German; and it calls for a power of effective use of this knowledge. Not all is open to one student, though he give a lifetime to the field; but if many students, from many angles, give earnest effort to this central task of preserving as living thought the hard-earned experience of generations, then indeed we may be certain that, whether America's addition to the world's culture be great or little, it will yet have won the gratitude of future generations, by preserving, in time of threatening darkness, man's most precious wisdom.

C. K.

WHERE THE LATIN GRAMMAR FAILS

It may be questioned seriously whether it is good policy to base instruction in Latin grammar almost wholly on the Latin text which the class is reading. But it is through this process of dissecting the reading lesson that teachers usually accomplish the major part of the grammatical drill, reserving comparatively little time for practice in translating English into Latin.

The fact that this is the conventional method of teaching Latin grammar may have insensibly influenced the makers of the standard School Grammars; but, however this may be, it is certainly true that the statements in these Grammars are often drawn with a view primarily to the elucidation of a Latin text,

with little regard for the needs of the student who is trying to learn how to *write* Latin.

Theoretically, of course, the rules of the Grammar should work as well one way as the other; but this is not always the case. Theoretically, too, when the rule of the Grammar does not meet the need of the student who is learning to *write*, the maker of the Composition book should intervene, and work over the rule into a form suited to the purpose in hand; but most makers of Composition books are rather chary of straying far from the orthodoxy of the Grammar.

The justice of these remarks will be more evident if concrete examples are presented; and attention is therefore invited, first, to the time-honored statement: 'verbs signifying to favor, help, please, trust, etc. take the dative'. As a preliminary to further discussion, it should perhaps be noted that, even from the point of view of elucidating a Latin text, this is a rather weak rule. Regularly it is followed by a statement that the Latin verbs in question do not really signify 'favor, help, please, trust, etc.', but that *servio*, for example, means 'be in bondage', *noceo*, 'be injurious', etc. This added statement is essential, as providing an explanation of the case use; but, at the same time, it gives the lie direct to the rule itself. For it is not, for example, the verb signifying 'injure' that takes the dative, but the verb that means 'be injurious'.

Having involved itself in this tangle, the Grammar next must needs add a warning that perfectly regular verbs like *iuvo* and *laedo* are 'exceptions' to the rule just branded as false. And it is only at the very end, buried perhaps in the small print of a footnote, that those who persevere find the center and core of the whole matter embodied in a list of *Latin* verbs which govern the dative, but which are usually so translated into English that their intransitive nature is obscured, e.g. *credo*, *faveo*, *fido*, *ignosco*, etc. Here at length we emerge upon solid ground; but one wonders how many students pursue the investigation thus far. The chances are that the majority find that their energies are exhausted in mastering the cadences of the misstatement of the original rule—'favor, help, please, trust, envy, threaten, pardon, spare'.

With even such a small stock of misinformation, a student may get on fairly well in the Caesar or the Cicero class; if he meets in the text *opitulator* with its dative, he has but to murmur 'favor, help, please, trust'; if, a little farther down on the page, he encounters *adiuvo* with the accusative, his attention is not likely to be arrested, if the teacher is discreetly silent.

But when the Composition class is called, a very different situation develops. With only a fragment of the original rule—shorn of all its props and qualifications—in his head; the pupil is all at sea when called on to handle a clause containing such a common English verb as 'help' or 'aid'. Ask a freshman class (after four years of High School training) what verbs of 'aiding' they know: usually *iuvo* is first mentioned;

then perhaps someone will think of *adiuvo*. At this point there is a full stop. If it is then asked what case *adiuvo* governs, the bolder spirits are inclined to venture dative—is it not a verb of 'helping' and is it not compounded with *ad*? The class seems almost aggrieved when told that *adiuvo* can govern only the accusative. Nor is good feeling restored by the writing on the board of a list of verbs of 'helping', so-called, that do govern the dative, e.g. *auxilior*, *opitulator*, *subvenio* and *succurro*. The students shake their heads, and even say that they never saw those words before.

In Latin Composition, it seems clear, this subject must be approached from a point of view exactly opposite to that taken by the Grammars, i.e. the student must begin by learning a list of *Latin* verbs whose intransitive nature is obscured by our ordinary English renderings. In fact this would cover the whole case; for verbs like *iuvo* and *laedo* would not enter the discussion at all.

This plan, proposed some years ago¹, is finding favor in some of the newer manuals on Latin Composition. It would simplify matters much if the Grammars should follow suit; and from every point of view it would be to their interest to do so. For the statement they now offer is an illogical patchwork of a number of complicated items, whereas the Composition rule proposed is scientific and simple—it puts the dative with special verbs on an equal footing with the ablative with special verbs. And as for the memory work involved, it is certainly no more difficult to memorize a list of fifteen or twenty Latin words than it is to master an equally long list of English mistranslations, and to keep in mind several important 'exceptions'.

Another Grammar rule that hinders rather than helps the student of Composition is the one that treats the dative with verbs compounded with *ad*, *ante*, *con*, *in*, *inter*, etc. This rule is on a more stable foundation than the one just treated, because it is based on the *form* of certain Latin words rather than upon an interpretation of their meaning. Moreover it requires but one qualification, albeit an important one, namely, that it applies only to 'some verbs' or 'many verbs' compounded with the prepositions mentioned in the list.

From the point of view of elucidating a Latin text this rule too does not work badly, because it need never be called up unless it is illustrated by the text. But the Composition class quite forgets the important qualification that the rule holds merely for some verbs or many verbs, and feels quite virtuous if only it can repeat the list of prepositions. It would doubtless cause a mild sensation in some Composition classes if the teacher should read from the Gildersleeve-Lodge Grammar, § 331, the list of prepositions found in compounds that govern the *accusative*: *ad*, *ante*, *circum*, *con*, *in*, *inter*, *ob*, *per*, *praeter*, *sub*, *subter*, *super*, *trans*.

¹See *The Classical Journal*, 2. 250 ff.

The difficulty at this point is rendered acute by the fact that many of the compounds governing the accusative are very common: compare e.g. *adorior*, *adeo*, *aggredior*, *convenio*, *invenio*, *interficio*, *oppugno*, *obsideo*, *subsequor*, etc. Indeed, up to a certain point, the more conscientious the student of Composition is, the greater seems to be his liability to error here. Unfortunately the list of compound verbs governing the dative is too long to be incorporated in a Grammar rule; otherwise this difficulty might be handled in the same way as the one first considered. It would help somewhat toward clearing up the situation if the Grammars should print side by side the rule for compounds governing the dative and the rule for compounds governing the accusative. With this arrangement, a careful student could hardly fail to see that the mere fact of composition with certain prepositions is not a decisive test of case use, and that, when he is translating from English into Latin, he must judge each compound on its own merits².

A third point at which study of the Grammars leaves the student in a very confused state of mind is found in the matter of relative clauses of characteristic. Approaching this subject with the idea of elucidating a Latin text, the maker of a Grammar naturally begins with the statement of a general principle, as, for example:

A relative clause used to express a quality or characteristic of a general or indefinite antecedent is called a Clause of Characteristic, and usually stands in the subjunctive.

Then follows a consideration of specific details. But experience with successive classes of College Freshmen seems to show that the attention of the High School pupil is caught by the leading statement (as being most important), and that little attention is given to what follows it.

Hence there is the greatest confusion in the Composition class. From the one general statement few students have gained any clear idea as to what a clause of characteristic really is; and practically everyone has forgotten that the rule states merely that the mood in a relative clause of characteristic is *usually* the subjunctive. The result is that some classes develop almost a mania for writing the subjunctive in relative clauses.

It is not altogether clear what help the Grammars might give by a revision of the conventional statement. But, leaving this question pending, the individual teacher can do much to encourage a saner use of moods in *qui*-clauses in the writing of his Composition class. The simplest plan, perhaps, is to require the pupils to memorize a list of the commonest concrete types of *qui*-clause in which they are to write the subjunctive.

Such a list can be made without even mentioning the word 'characteristic'; e.g.

- (1) Clauses of Purpose.
- (2) Clauses of Tendency or Result³.
- (3) Causal and Concessive Clauses.
- (4) Clauses dependent upon general expressions of existence and non-existence (*sunt qui*, *nemo est qui*, etc.).

The chief advantage in dealing with the matter in this way is that the class is called upon to handle only concrete and more or less familiar distinctions, for, as noted above, it is not necessary even to point out that some of the classes fall under the head of 'characteristic'.

If, now, the class is instructed to write the subjunctive in relative clauses only when they can be brought under the headings named in the list given by the teacher, as set forth above, a great improvement will at once appear in the Composition work. But, even if the pupils follow directions closely, it is interesting to observe that the usage of the class will fall far short of the restraint which an author like Cicero shows in the use of the subjunctive in relative clauses. Note the indicative in the following passages:

Neque enim potest exercitum is continere imperator, qui se ipse non continet, neque severus esse in iudicando, qui alios in se severos esse iudices non vult (Pomp. 38).

Etenim si is, qui non defendit iniuriam. . . cum potest, iniuste facit. . . , qualis habendus est is, qui non modo non repellit, sed etiam adiuvat iniuriam? (De Off. 3.74).

In regard to relative clauses, it is the problem of the Composition teacher to secure at least a measure of recognition for the indicative mood. The procedure suggested above is of course little more than a rule of thumb; but it helps much to the desired end.

Once again, and finally, the Grammars serve very poorly the needs of the Composition class in their treatment of certain clauses introduced by the conjunction *cum*. Causal and concessive clauses so introduced of course cause no trouble, nor do temporal *cum*-clauses of the present and the future cause distress. But the light which the Grammars shed on temporal and circumstantial *cum*-clauses of the past is mostly darkness, so far as the students of Composition are concerned; here, again, the more painstaking a pupil is, the more liable he seems—up to a certain point—to be misled by what he remembers of the statement in the Grammar.

To secure some definite facts and figures, the three following English sentences were submitted to a College class of 32 members. They were directed to translate them into Latin, using *cum* in each case as the rendering for 'when':

- (1) When they saw Caesar coming to their aid, they rushed fiercely upon the enemy.

²On the dative with compound verbs, see E. B. Lease, The Dative with Prepositional Compounds, *American Journal of Philology*, 33. 285-300; E. B. Lease, Prepositional Compounds with the Dative in High-School Latin and the First Year in College, *The Classical Journal*, 8:7-16; B. M. Allen, The Dative with Compound Verb in Latin, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5. 170-173. C. K.

³For example, see Cicero, Cat. 3. 25, where *eius modi, quae . . . pertinerent* is closely followed by *eius modi. . . ut non . . . diiudicatae sint*.

- (2) When they were on the march, they never stopped to collect grain.
- (3) When I was driving Catiline into exile, I saw that all bad citizens would blame me (cf. Cicero Cat. 3.3).

In the first of these sentences the causal shading, of course, calls for the subjunctive; the repeated action of the second demands the indicative; and the third is modeled on a sentence in which Cicero himself uses the indicative—therefore purely temporal, according to the Grammars. The students subjected to this test were enrolled in a Freshman class presupposing at least four years of High School training. The results were not very different from what they would have been if the choice of mood had been left to blind chance, namely:

Four of the 32 students solved the problem (subjunctive in 1, indicative in 2 and 3).

Four misjudged every sentence, writing the indicative in 1, and the subjunctive in 2 and 3.

Three used the subjunctive in 1 and 3, with the indicative in 2.

Three just reversed this, with the indicative in 1 and 3, and the subjunctive in 2.

Six wrote the subjunctive in all three sentences.

Three wrote the indicative in all three sentences.

Nine showed other combinations, all different from the above.

Summarized by sentences, the results were:

	Sentence 1	Sentence 2	Sentence 3
Indicative	14	13	16
Subjunctive	16 ⁴	15	14

The test was given wholly unannounced; and the result makes it all too clear that teachers are simply beating the air in trying to teach certain *cum*-constructions on the basis of the rules laid down in most School Grammars. For the class was a representative one, drawn from a large number of Schools, and recruited from people ambitious enough to continue the study of Latin in College.

That careful preparation may make matters even worse would seem to be shown by the following test. In a matriculation examination for which students had presumably made more or less careful and recent preparation, the following sentence was set for translation into Latin:

When the soldiers heard this, they advanced rapidly, so that the enemy would not think that the army of the Roman people wanted to avoid danger.

It might seem that the causal relation here underlying was sufficiently obvious to catch the student's attention. Yet on the 32 papers which showed a clear choice of mood, the indicative was used 20 times, the subjunctive only 12 times.

The difficulty encountered by Composition classes in handling this subject seems to be due to two causes. In the first place, the terms 'circumstantial' and 'tem-

poral' are used by the Grammars to mark a distinction which most students find it hard to grasp, and still harder to remember. If any teacher doubts this, let him put before his class in an offhand way the following sentence:

When the news of victory arrived, there was great rejoicing in the city.

If the class is like most of those known to the writer, the majority of the students will say without hesitation that the subordinate clause is temporal, and that its verb, therefore, should stand in the indicative.

In the second place, the statements usually found in the Grammars are themselves inexact, the authors being misled and prejudiced by general theories as to the historic development of the *cum*-construction. These theories are, of course, important and interesting. Thus we learn that, in early Latin, *cum* everywhere is construed with the indicative, and that the subjunctive first begins to make an inroad into the causal and concessive *cum*-clauses of Terence. Thereafter the use of the subjunctive spread rapidly, its conquests perhaps being due largely to the influence of the somewhat parallel use of the mood in relative clauses of characteristic.

On the basis of this theory, the Grammars lay down the general principle that the subjunctive is used in all causal, concessive, and 'circumstantial' *cum*-clauses, assigning to the indicative all the purely temporal *cum*-clauses. Satisfactory as this distinction may appear in the abstract, any reader who opens his Caesar or his Cicero with unprejudiced mind will see at once that the rule does not hold for these authors. For in their writings the subjunctive has penetrated still farther into the *cum*-construction, appearing with great frequency in clauses that surely are purely temporal. For example, no one without a theory to uphold would think of finding anything but verbal variety in the interchange of stock phrases like *quo cum venisset* and *eo ubi venit*.

What of specific instances like the following?

Cum dies hibernorum complures transissent, . . . subito per exploratores certior factus est. . . omnis noctu discessisse (Caesar, B.G. 3.2).

Litterae. . . integris signis praetoribus traduntur; ipsi comprehensi ad me, cum iam dilucesceret, deducuntur (Cicero, Cat. 3.6).

Confronted with this second sentence, a bright student remarked in perfect good faith: "I should think that Cicero ought to have written the indicative there".

The farther this matter is followed up, the clearer it becomes that the Grammars are exploiting a theory at the expense of the facts. Thus, in his Syntax of High School Latin, Mr. Byrne follows the old-fashioned triple division of *cum*-clauses, i.e. causal, concessive, and temporal, making no attempt to subdivide the last named group into circumstantial and purely temporal. For Caesar, the figures for this circumstantial-temporal group are:

⁴The total for each sentence falls short of 32 because there were some blanks on the papers, and also some verb forms not found in the paradigms.

	Indicative	Subjunctive
Imperfect	1	73
Perfect	3	0
Pluperfect	4	53

Without stopping to look up these cases, most readers will feel the absurdity of assuming that in four books of Caesar there is but one case of purely temporal *cum* with the imperfect tense, and four with the pluperfect, especially as, in this small total, provision must be made for cases of repeated action.

The situation then may be graphically represented as follows:

	'Since' Cause	'Though' Concession	'When' Circumstance	Time
1				→
2			→	
3			→	

In this diagram the first line indicates roughly the point to which the subjunctive actually penetrated into *cum*-clauses of the past in the usage of a writer like Caesar. The second line shows where the theory of the Grammar stops. And the third indicates the usage of the majority of students, who find the Grammar rule a puzzling and perverse guide.

It may not be flattering to face the fact; but it is true, nevertheless, that the old-fashioned rule '*cum*-temporal introduces the subjunctive in the imperfect and pluperfect tenses, the indicative elsewhere' is for nearly all students a far better guide to the usage of Caesar and Cicero than is the new doctrine. Indeed, if the old rule is supplemented by the statement that 'Repeated action calls for the indicative', and the English sentences for translation into Latin are framed with any care, this rule of thumb will be found to work exceedingly well; for at this stage of the work the class in writing need not be troubled by the introduction of the rare and the incidental.

As noted at the beginning of this paper, the makers of Composition books usually help us little at points where the Grammar fails. Moreover, it is far from the ideal to have one rule for reading and another for writing. A heavy responsibility therefore is put upon the makers and revisers of School Grammars to fashion statements that will be a safe guide both for those who read and for those who write.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, California.

H. C. NUTTING.

BOOK REVIEWS

Roman Imperialism. By Tenney Frank. New York: The Macmillan Company (1914). Pp. 365. \$2.50.

Mr. Frank registers a vigorous protest against those historians who must needs apply the subtleties of twentieth century diplomacy to the proceedings of the

bourgeois Senate of ancient Rome and who are afraid that they may be regarded as simpletons if they interpret the simple negotiations of a primitive people in a simple way. It is true that scientific historians have done much in purging the ancient sources of their anachronisms, but they have been only too willing to accept the words of Vergil as the actual inspiration of Rome's foreign policy from Aeneas to Augustus. The modern factors which develop the imperialistic idea in nations, such as innate desire of possession, commercialism, necessity of expansion to provide for surplus population, etc., can not be applied with justice to the early Romans, who were an agricultural people, not thickly settled, possessed of no factories, trade or commerce, a people who in voting for war had not only to tax themselves directly to defray the expenses of the campaign, but must leave the plow to take up the sword. In a period covering many centuries and the changing conditions of the Roman Republic no single formula can be consistently applied.

Under the Republic the governing body at Rome was the Senate, a body powerfully influenced by ancestral tradition, extremely jealous of its authority, and thoroughly permeated with the religious restrictions of the *ius fetiale*, which forbade wars of aggression. As long as the Senate controlled the policies of the state, Rome declared war only when compelled to fight by the aggressiveness of her neighbors. The territory of the enemy was annexed only if it proved necessary to do so in the interests of law and order. Mr. Frank, taking as his text the *ius fetiale*, analyzes the various steps in the expansion of Rome, briefly but clearly setting forth the motives of the dominant parties in the political life of the state and summarizing the local conditions from which the imperialistic idea grew and flourished in democratic surroundings.

The fertile plain of Latium was surrounded by nations not so richly endowed and bound by no conscientious scruples in regard to offensive warfare. By virtue of constant pressure from without Rome developed a power of endurance and an organizing faculty which eventually, when the time for aggressive action came, proved irresistible. When the encroachments of the Volscians were checked, Rome took the offensive, and, after peace was made, she guarded against future attacks by planting Latin colonies in the conquered territory. This policy ultimately proved to be most successful and played an important part in later imperialism. At first, however, expansion was too rapid and the home federation was so severely weakened that it could not withstand the Aequi. The invasion of the Gauls, though utterly draining the resources of the state, proved to be the turning point in Rome's fortunes. Her position on the Tiber, which protected her from the Etruscans, her harbor, and the fact that this was a natural distributing center led to an extraordinary development which speedily gave her the preëminence in the Latin confederacy. The conquest of the Latins was the first step towards